

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-6 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yan (6,342,000).

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art reference cited by the Examiner. Applicant also submits the following comments.

The claimed invention discloses “a sand-belt finishing machine, comprising a main frame, and two grinding devices, wherein:

the main frame is substantially L-shaped and includes a longitudinal portion and a transverse portion; and

each of the two grinding devices has a first end rested on and fixed to a first side of the longitudinal portion of the main frame, and a second end formed with a free end” as disclosed in the amended claim 1.

With reference to the Yan reference, it disclosed a sander comprising a stand 10 including an endless sander member 11 movably or operatively provided thereon for sanding purposes, and including a wall 12 extended upward from the rear portion thereof for supporting a housing 13 thereon. The housing 13 includes a support 15 extended inward of the inner chamber 14 of the housing 13. A roller 20 is rotatably secured to the support 15 at a pivot shaft 21. Another roller 30 is rotatably

secured on a bracket 31 at a pivot axle 32. A sander belt 40 is engaged over the rollers 20 and 30 so as to be moved by the rollers 20 and 30. A motor may be coupled to one of the rollers 20 and 30 for rotating the rollers 20 and 30 and for driving the sander belt 40 to work onto the workpieces. The bracket 31 includes a pin 33 extended downward therefrom and rotatably engaged into the support 15 such that the pin 33 is formed as a pivot pin 33 for pivotally or rotatably securing the bracket 31 to the support 15, and such that the bracket 31 and the roller 30 are rotatable relative to the support 15 about the pivot pin 33.

In comparison, in the Yan reference, the wall 12 is extended upward from the rear portion of the stand 10 for supporting the housing 13 thereon, and the sander belt 40 is received in the housing 13, so that the sander belt 40 is not in contact with the wall 12.

Thus, the Yan reference does not teach “each of the two grinding devices has a first end rested on and fixed to a first side of the longitudinal portion of the main frame” as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

In addition, in the Yan reference, the housing 13 is supported by the wall 12, and the sander belt 40 is received in the housing 13, so that the sander belt 40 is not supported by the wall 12.

Thus, the Yan reference does not teach “the two grinding devices are supported by the longitudinal portion of the main frame” as disclosed in the amended claim 3 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Yan reference, a motor may be coupled to one of the rollers 20 and 30 for rotating the rollers 20 and 30 and for driving the sander belt 40 to work onto the workpieces.

Thus, the Yan reference does not teach “a driving device mounted on and protruded outward from a second side of the longitudinal portion of the main frame for driving the two grinding devices” as disclosed in the amended claim 5 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Yan reference, the endless sander member 11 is movably or operatively provided on the stand 10 for sanding purposes, and does not function as a lift platform.

Thus, the Yan reference does not teach “a lift device including a lift platform that is movable relative to the two grinding devices and the transverse portion of the main frame” as disclosed in the amended claim 6 of the claimed invention.

Therefore, from the above mentioned descriptions, it is apparent that the claimed invention has disclosed a sand-belt finishing machine whose structure and function are quite different from and patentably distinguishable over that of the Yan reference. It is believed that the Yan reference does not provide the elements and objectives as are disclosed in the claimed invention, and cannot render obvious the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for all of the above-mentioned reasons, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the amended claims 1-6

should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Courtesy, cooperation and skill of Examining Attorney Dung V. Nguyen are appreciated and acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

Charles E. Baxley, Esquire
Attorney of Record
USPTO Reg. 20,149
90 John Street, Third Floor
New York, New York 10038
Telephone 212-791-7200
Facsimile 212-791-7276
E-mail ceb@hartbaxley.com